*REMARKS*

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action mailed October 5, 2007 rejected claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, and 51. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Office Action. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, 51, and 55-74 are pending. More specifically, claims 1, 6, 17, 26, 30, 39, 43, and 51 are amended and claims 55-74 are added, and no new matter is added to the present application by these amendments. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

I.      **Present Status of Patent Application**

Claims 1-3, 6, 10-14, 17-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-48, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kamen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Kamen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067) in view of *Lemmons, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,775). To the extent that these rejections have not been rendered moot by the amendment of claims, they are respectfully traversed.

II.     **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

A.      Claims 1-3 and 10-14

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kamen, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 and 10-14 are allowable.

**Independent claim 1**, as amended, recites:

1.      A system for providing interactive media services comprising:
   ***memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently***; and
   logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user input requesting a change in the IPG channel listing characteristic,
   wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently**. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not disclose memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently.

The Office Action alleges:

Kamen discloses a number of channels displayed on the screen depending on the user selected EPG mode. For example, in FIG.2A the EPG has identified a number, i.e., three channels (ABC, FOX and CBS) to be displayed concurrently in the "Program Listings Today" mode. In another/changed user selected mode, e.g., "Sports Listings", "NEWS Listings" modes, etc., similar to the mode selected in FIG. 2 (not shown), which identifies and determines a number of channels that are showing programs that fit the user selected category (Sports in FIG. 2) at a specified time period (7 pm in the case of FIG. 2)).

*See Office Action*, p. 4.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects 18 channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, all 18 channels will not be listed on the same page. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many of those 18 channels will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently. Thus, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 1 as amended, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 1 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2, 3, and 10-14 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2, 3, and 10-14 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 1. *See Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002) *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 54 U.S.P.Q.2d 1086 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, since dependent claims 2, 3, and 10-14 are patentable over *Kamen*, the rejection to claims 2, 3, and 10-14 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

B.     Claim 6

The Final Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable.

**Independent claim 6**, as amended, recites:

6.     A system for providing interactive media services comprising:
      *memory for storing interactive program guide (IPG) configuration data that is*
          *used to determine an IPG time listing characteristic where the time*
          *listing characteristic is at least one of the following:*
               *a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently*
                 *and a predetermined coverage of a time listing*; and
      logic configured to modify the IPG configuration data in response to a first user
          input requesting a change in the IPG time listing characteristic,
      wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia
          presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing
          characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such
          that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia
          modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.
(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 as amended is allowable for at least the

reason that *Kamen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **memory for storing interactive**

**program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG time listing**

**characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a**

**predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined**

**coverage of a time listing**. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses

changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not disclose memory for storing interactive

program guide (IPG) configuration data that is used to determine an IPG time listing

characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a

predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a

time listing.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects channels to be displayed in the

"Program Listings Today" mode, concurrent time listings are not configured. *Kamen* fails to

teach configuring how many time listings will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore,

*Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG time listing characteristic where the time listing

characteristic comprises a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently.

Therefore, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 6 as amended, and the rejection should

be withdrawn.

    C.    <u>Claims 17-23</u>

The Office Action rejects claims 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below,

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-23 are allowable.

**Independent claim 17**, as amended, recites:

17.    A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
        *receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently*; and

> modifying IPG configuration data stored in memory in response to receiving the
> first user input, where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the
> IPG channel listing characteristic,
> wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia
> presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel
> listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user
> such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action
> indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 17 as amended is allowable for at

least the reason that *Kamen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving a first user**

**input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing**

**characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number**

**of channels presented concurrently**. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Kamen*

discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not disclose receiving a first user input

requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic where

the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented

concurrently.

The Office Action alleges:

> Kamen discloses a number of channels displayed on the screen depending on the
> user selected EPG mode. For example, in FIG.2A the EPG has identified a
> number, i.e., three channels (ABC, FOX and CBS) to be displayed concurrently in
> the "Program Listings Today" mode. In another/changed user selected mode,
> e.g., "Sports Listings", "NEWS Listings" modes, etc., similar to the mode
> selected in FIG. 2 (not shown), which identifies and determines a number of

> channels that are showing programs that fit the user selected category (Sports in FIG. 2) at a specified time period (7 pm in the case of FIG. 2)).

*See Office Action*, p. 4.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects 18 channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, all 18 channels will not be listed on the same page. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many of those 18 channels will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently. Thus, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 17 as amended, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 17 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 18-23 (which depend from independent claim 17) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 18-23 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 17. Therefore, since dependent claims 18-23 are patentable over *Kamen*, the rejection to claims 18-23 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

### D.     Claim 26

The Office Action rejects claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 is allowable.

**Independent claim 26**, as amended, recites:

26. A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
*receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following:*
*a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing*; and
modifying IPG configuration data stored in memory in response to receiving the first user input, where the IPG configuration data is used to determine the IPG time listing characteristic,
wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits

that independent claim 26 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not

disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving a first user input requesting a change in an**

**interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic where the time listing**

**characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings**

**presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing**. Even if, assuming

for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not

disclose receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG)

time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a

predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a

time listing.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, concurrent time listings are not configured. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many time listings will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently. Therefore, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 26 as amended, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

E.      Claims 30-36

The Office Action rejects claims 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30-36 are allowable.

**Independent claim 30**, as amended, recites:

30.     A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
        ***receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently***; and
        changing the IPG channel listing characteristic in accordance with the first user input,
        wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits

that independent claim 30 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not

disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving a first user input requesting a change in an**

**interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing**

**characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently**.

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen

characteristic, it does not disclose receiving a first user input requesting a change in an

interactive program guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing

characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently.

The Office Action alleges:

> Kamen discloses a number of channels displayed on the screen depending on the
> user selected EPG mode. For example, in FIG.2A the EPG has identified a
> number, i.e., three channels (ABC, FOX and CBS) to be displayed concurrently in
> the "Program Listings Today" mode. In another/changed user selected mode,
> e.g., "Sports Listings", "NEWS Listings" modes, etc., similar to the mode
> selected in FIG. 2 (not shown), which identifies and determines a number of
> channels that are showing programs that fit the user selected category (Sports in
> FIG. 2) at a specified time period (7 pm in the case of FIG. 2)).

*See Office Action*, p. 4.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects 18 channels to be displayed in the

"Program Listings Today" mode, all 18 channels will not be listed on the same page. *Kamen*

fails to teach configuring how many of those 18 channels will be displayed concurrently in the

IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG channel listing characteristic

where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented

concurrently.  Therefore, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 30, and the rejection

should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 30 as amended is allowable over the cited references of

record, dependent claims 31-36 (which depend from independent claim 30) are allowable as a

matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 31-36 contain all the steps/features of

independent claim 30.  Therefore, since dependent claims 31-36 are patentable over *Kamen*, the

rejection to claims 31-36 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.


F.      Claim 39

The Office Action rejects claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067).  For at least the reasons set forth below,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 39 is allowable.


**Independent claim 39**, as amended, recites:

39.     A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
          *receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide*
                    *(IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is*
                    *at least one of the following:*
                              *a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently*
                                        *and a predetermined coverage of a time listing*; and
          changing the IPG time listing characteristic in accordance with the first user
          input,
          wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia
                    presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing
                    characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such
                    that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia
                    modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.
(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 39 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing**. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not disclose receiving a first user input requesting a change in an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, concurrent time listings are not configured. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many time listings will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently. Therefore, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 39, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

G.     Claims 43-48

The Final Office Action rejects claims 43-48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067).  For at least the reasons set forth below,

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 43-48 are allowable.

**Independent claim 43,** as amended, recites:

43.     A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
        *receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG)*
                *channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic*
                *comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently*;
                and
        providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the
                first user input,
        wherein the IPG channel listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia
                presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG channel
                listing characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user
                such that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action
                indicia modifies the IPG channel listing characteristic.
(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue.  Applicant respectfully submits

that independent claim 43 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not

disclose, teach, or suggest at **receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program**

**guide (IPG) channel listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic**

**comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently**.  Even if, assuming

for the sake of argument, *Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not

disclose receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) channel

listing characteristic, where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently.

The Office Action alleges:

> Kamen discloses a number of channels displayed on the screen depending on the user selected EPG mode. For example, in FIG.2A the EPG has identified a number, i.e., three channels (ABC, FOX and CBS) to be displayed concurrently in the "Program Listings Today" mode. In another/changed user selected mode, e.g., "Sports Listings", "NEWS Listings" modes, etc., similar to the mode selected in FIG. 2 (not shown), which identifies and determines a number of channels that are showing programs that fit the user selected category (Sports in FIG. 2) at a specified time period (7 pm in the case of FIG. 2)).

*See Office Action*, p. 4.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects 18 channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, all 18 channels will not be listed on the same page. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many of those 18 channels will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG channel listing characteristic where the channel listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of channels presented concurrently. Thus, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 43, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 43 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 44-48 (which depend from independent claim 43) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 44-48 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 43. Therefore, since dependent claims 44-48 are patentable over *Kamen*, the rejection to claims 44-48 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

H.    Claim 51

The Office Action rejects claim 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067). For at least the reasons set forth below,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 51 is allowable.

**Independent claim 51**, as amended, recites:

51.    A method for configuring a user interface, comprising:
*receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time
listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one
of the following:*
*a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently
and a predetermined coverage of a time listing*; and
providing the user with an IPG screen that has the characteristic identified via the
first user input,
wherein the IPG time listing characteristic is represented by an object indicia
presented to the user and an action for reconfiguring the IPG time listing
characteristic is represented by a tool indicia presented to the user such
that a first user input of selecting the object indicia and the action indicia
modifies the IPG time listing characteristic.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose,

teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits

that independent claim 51 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Kamen* does not

disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving a first user input identifying an interactive**

**program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at**

**least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently**

**and a predetermined coverage of a time listing**. Even if, assuming for the sake of argument,

*Kamen* discloses changing an IPG screen characteristic, it does not disclose receiving a first user input identifying an interactive program guide (IPG) time listing characteristic, where the time listing characteristic is at least one of the following: a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently and a predetermined coverage of a time listing.

If, for instance, a user of the system of *Kamen* selects channels to be displayed in the "Program Listings Today" mode, concurrent time listings are not configured. *Kamen* fails to teach configuring how many time listings will be displayed concurrently in the IPG. Therefore, *Kamen* does not disclose the feature of an IPG time listing characteristic where the time listing characteristic comprises a predetermined number of time listings presented concurrently. Therefore, *Kamen* does not anticipate independent claim 51, and the rejection should be withdrawn.


## III.    Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

### Claims 15 and 16

The Office Action rejects claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Kamen, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,067) in view of *Lemmons, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,775). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are allowable.

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 15 and 16 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 15 and 16 contain all the steps/features of independent

claim 1. Therefore, the rejection to claims 15 and 16 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claims 15 and 16, *Lemmons* does not cure the deficiencies of *Kamen* noted above. Therefore, claims 15 and 16 are considered patentable over any combination of these references.

## IV. Newly Added Claims 55-74

Applicant respectfully submits that newly added claims 55-74 are allowable over the references of record for at least the reason that the references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, the above-emphasized features of independent claims 1, 6, 17, 26, 30, 39, 43, and 51, which are incorporated in respective dependent claims 55-74. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added with the new claims.

## V. Miscellaneous Issues

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

## *CONCLUSION*

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above,

Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered

moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-3, 6, 10-23, 26, 30-36, 39, 43-

48, 51, and 55-74 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of

the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the

opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the

Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required,

beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper.

However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this

paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required

therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit

account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/BAB/_____
**Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,**
 **HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500